UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,515	12/05/2003	Anoop Anantha	MS306116.1/MSFTP502US	2367

27195 7590 02/05/2007

AMIN. TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
24TH FLOOR, NATIONAL CITY CENTER
1900 EAST NINTH STREET
CLEVELAND, OH 44114

EXAMINER	
TRAORE, FATOUMATA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2109	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/729,515	ANANTHA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Fatoumata Traore	2109	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12/05/2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *06/01/2004*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response of the original filing of December 12, 2003. Claims 1-32 are pending and have been considered below.

Examiner Note

The applicant appears to be attempting to invoke 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph in claim 30 by using "means-plus-function" language. However, the Examiner notes that the only "means" for performing these cited functions in the specification appears to be computer programs modules. While the claims pass the first test of the three-prong test used to determine invocation of paragraph 6, since no other specific structural limitations are disclosed in the specification, the claims do not meet the other tests of the three-prong test. Therefore, 35 U.S.C. 112 6th paragraph has not been invoked when considering these claims below.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 17 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claims, or amend the claims to place the claim in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claims in independent form. Claim 17, is improperly dependent on claim 1, because: the examiner notes that the applicant is claiming a computer program in claims 17 which fail to add, delete, or change any of the steps in the parent claim.

2. Claim 1 is objected because of the following informalities: the examiner notes the use of acronyms (API) throughout the claim 1 without first including a description in plaintext, as required.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1-3, 5, 6,9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Garg et al** (US 6289458).

Claim 1: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

a. A platform component that receives request to access an object by an entity (a computer system comprises an operating system to control applications and services running on the system) (column 3, lines14-17);

b. A data store that stores security information on class of the objects (the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40); and

c. A verification component that employs the security information to verify that the entity has permission to call API for the object and/or

operate on the object (the access control module provide a centralize standard mechanism to evaluate whether or not various request for operations affecting objects should be granted or denied (column 7, lines30-35).

Claim 2: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the verification component exposes the object is permission exists (the data structures includes fields defining whether access is granted) (column 3, lines30-35).

Claim 3: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the verification component masks the object is permission does not exist (the data structures includes fields defining whether access is deny) (column 3, lines30-35).

Claim 5: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the verification component facilitates that partners receive full access to API's and /or object s for which there is a business need and partial or limited access to other API's or business objects (a system user is granted and denied access to individual properties or sets of properties) (column 3, lines45-50).

Claim 6: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the data store provides a default or determined security information related to a class (the access control list contains zero or more access control entries, which define the access control applied to the object) (column 8, lines34-38).

Claim 9: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further comprises a management portal to facilitate authorization (file system manger maintains and coordinates access to file system) (column 7, lines 25-29).

Claim 10: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further comprises a component to provide an explicit security mapping for an object the access control list contains zero or more access control entries, which define the access control applied to the object. Each entry in the list defines a set of permission to be applied to a particular UUSERID or GROUPID with respect to either the object as a whole or individual properties of object. Desirably the order of entries in the access control list is significant) (column 8, lines 35-55).

Claim 11: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further comprises a component to enable an

implicit security mapping from an explicit mapped object or to derive an implicit security permission by utilizing related objects(security descriptor provides details on the security and access control applicable to object (column 8, lines 25-30).

Claim 12: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1, above and further discloses that the authorization employs operating system identities to facilitates security authorization procedure (security descriptor contains various properties including the owner security identifier and access control list) (column 8, lines27-30).

3. Claims 18-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Corrigan et al**. (US 6640097).

Claim 18: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

d. Storing one or more security options in a database, the security options related to automate billing and provisioning system (in one embodiment, the portal comprises a customer care provisioning interface and provisioning database, said interface allowing network operator to access said database for inputting and updating operator specific data for subscriber) (clonm2 lines65-69, column 3 lines1-3);

e. Assigning security options to a class (the platform comprises means for controlling mobile subscriber access according to the security criteria) (column 2, lines9015); and

f. Inheriting the security options by object members of the class (verification of subscriber access rights is an intrinsic part of the session management functions provided by the portal (column 9, lines17-20).

Claim 19: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises at least one of explicit and implicit assigning the security options to object members of a class (security future such as white list or blacklist are used to authenticates access to particular services (column 5, lines 27-30).

Claim 20: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises accessing database via an application programming interface (in one embodiment, the portal comprises a secure web-bases self provisioning interface comprising means for setting mobile network subscriber s to select a portfolio of personalized services (column 2, lines53-57).

Claim 21: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 20 above, and further authorizes the API (the node

controls all subscriber accesses to the network operator managed service portfolio and authenticates the ID to verify that the subscriber is authorized (column 5, lines 33-38).

Claim 22: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 21 above, and further comprise returning an error code if an authorization procedure fails(the push server also support the push access protocol result notification. It will acknowledge successful or report unsuccessful transmission and delivery of the information pushed and return a status) (column 11, lines 10-15).

Claim 23: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 21 above, and further comprises analyzing a simple object request (a mobile user service request reaches the node as URL request in http format, and the node presents a login screen. The user inputs access security codes and the node interfaces on the internet side to have the required content delivered) (column 4 lines 1-10).

Claim 24: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 21 above, and further comprises analyzing one or more security credentials (verification of subscriber access rights is an intrinsic part of the session management functions provided by the portal (column 9, lines 15-20).

Claim 25: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 24 above, and comprises employing a cache to process the credentials (portal comprises a customer care provisioning interface and a provisioning database) (column 2, lines 65-68, fig 2)

Claim 26: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises a subscription platform service (the platform comprises means for controlling subscriber access according to security criteria (column 2, lines 5-10).

Claim 27: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further discloses that the security options are associated with default security parameters (a generic subscriber class which is defined within the portal and represents common characteristics of all subscribers) (column 8, lines 44-48).

Claim 28: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises overriding default security parameters with other options (from the generic subscriber class are derived many subscriber sub-class that allow the portal to manage subscriber profiles across a wide range of different technologies) (column 8, lines 47-50).

Claim 29: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 18 above, and further comprises employing an intermediate proxy that places call in a subscription on behalf of another tenant (the wireless application protocol (WAP) is a complete WAP capable mobile stations to access applications and services which may be hosted either within the network operator's own domain or in another location (column 10, lines 50-55).

Claim 30: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

Means for authenticating at least one entity attempting access to an online billing and service (subscriber authentication) (column 4, line 33);

Means for authorizing the at least one entity (authorities subscriber access through white and black lists) (column 5, lines50-55)); and

Means for associating a security parameter with at least one business object from a globalize region of database (the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40).

Claim 31: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

a. An application programming interface packet to identify a partner (authenticates the subscriber ID to verify that the subscriber is authorized (column 5, lines35-40);

b. A security credential packet to facilitate authorization of the partner (Authorized subscriber access through white and black lists) (column 5, lines 50-55); and

c. A security parameter packet inherited by a business object to facilitate access to a subscription platform database (the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40).

Claim 32: **Corrigan et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object comprising:

a. At least one security field indicating global security parameters in a subscription platform database (Authorized subscriber access through white and black lists) (column 5, lines 50-55);

b. At least one object field associated with an account in the database (the portal comprises means for instantiating a payment management class) (column 3, lines 25-30); and

d. At least one class field to associate the security field object(the data structure includes an identifier used to indicated a specific object property or set of properties to which the permission apply) (column 3, lines 35-40).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 7, 8,13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Corrigan et al** (US6640097).

Claim 4: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not disclose that the system further comprise a subscription platform to facilitate automated billing an provisioning accounts. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system, which provides billing and tariff generation with configurable billing provisioning functions (column 4, lines 45-50). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include subscription platform to facilitating automated billing and provisioning accounts. One would have been motivated to do so in order to facilitate accounts management.

Claim 7: **Garg et al** and **Corrigan et al** disclose a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 6 above, and **Corrigan et al** further comprises a component to override the default security information with higher or different security options (from the generic subscriber class are derived many subscriber sub-class that allow the portal to manage subscriber profiles across a wide range of

different technologies) (column 8, lines 47-50). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for **Garg et al** to override default security with higher or different security options. One would have been motivated to do in order to make the system efficient.

Claim 8: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose a component that supports proxies tenant callers. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a the wireless application protocol (WAP) is a complete WAP capable mobile stations to access applications and services which may be hosted either within the network operator's own domain or in another location (column 10, lines 50-55). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for **Garg et al** to support proxies tenant callers. One would have been motivated to do in order to make the system flexible.

Claim 13: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises al least one of a sign-up API caller, an account management API caller, and a customer care API caller. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a customer care provisioning interface including a device provisioning function which enables the operator to ensure

that content is matched to the device type (column 5, lines 10-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for **Garg et al** to include a customer care API caller. One would have been motivated to do in order to simplify service management.

Claim 14: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 13 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises al least one API related to at least of a sign-up API group, an account management API group, a customer care API group, and object designer API group. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further a customer care provisioning interface including a device provisioning function which enables the operator to ensure that content is matched to the device type (column 5, lines 10-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was for **Garg et al** made to include a customer care API group. One would have been motivated to do in order to make the system efficient.

Claim 15: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises an authorization logic that determines whether an API can access an object via an access rights set. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a node acting as a service manager for

mobile subscriber. It controls all subscriber accesses to the network operators managed service portfolio and authenticates the subscriber ID to verify that the subscriber is authorized to access a particular service before opening a secure connection (column 5, lines 35-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include an authorization component in **Garg et al**. One would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict and control access to various components and services provides within the system.

Claim 16: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises at least one of a restricted audience offer, a conversion component, and a payment instrument component. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a payment management class from which are derived two sub-classes post-paid and pre-paid (column 10, lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made for **Garg et al** to include a payment component. One would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict and control access to various components and services provides within the system.

Claim 17: **Garg et al** discloses a system to provide access control to individual properties of an object as in claim 1 above, but does not explicitly disclose that the system further comprises a computer excusable instructions stored thereon to perform at least one of the

platform component and the verification component. **Corrigan et al** discloses a similar system to provide access control to individual properties that further discloses a verification component (column 9, line15-20). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include a verification component. One would have been motivated to do so in order to restrict and control access to various components and services provides within the system.

Conclusion

- The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- Boebert et al (US 4713753) discloses a secure data processing system architecture with format Control.
- Fabbio (US 5335346) discloses an access control policies for an object-oriented database including access control lists which span across object boundaries.
- Shannon (US 6233618) discloses an access control of networked data.
- Staamann et al (US 2003/0145094) discloses a Method and system for session based authorization and access control for networked application object.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Fatoumata Traore whose telephone number is (571) 270-1685.

The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 7:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. and every other Friday from 7:30 a.m. to 3:30 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jim W. Myhre, can be reached on (571) 272 6722. The fax phone number for Formal or Official faxes to Technology Center 2100 is (571) 273-3800. Draft or Informal faxes, which will not be entered in the application, may be submitted directly to the examiner at (571) 274-1685.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2100.

FT
January 24, 2007

James W. Myhre
Supervisory Patent Examiner